## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ARMONI MASUD JOHNSON,

No. 3:19-CV-01512

Petitioner,

(Chief Judge Brann)

v.

(Chief Magistrate Judge Mehalchick)

SUPERINTENDENT THOMAS MCGINLEY, *et al.*,

Respondents.

## **ORDER**

## **SEPTEMBER 2, 2021**

Armoni Masud Johnson, a Pennsylvania state prisoner, filed this 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition seeking to vacate his convictions and sentence.<sup>1</sup> Johnson raises numerous claims in his petition, including claims of a *Batson*<sup>2</sup> violation, and that his due process rights were violated.<sup>3</sup>

In June 2021, Chief Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court deny the petition and deny as moot Johnson's motion for summary judgment.<sup>4</sup> Specifically, Chief Magistrate

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Doc. 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Batson v. Kentucky, 476 U.S. 79 (1986).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Docs. 1, 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Doc. 34.

Judge Mehalchick recommends finding that Johnson's claims are procedurally defaulted, and that no exceptions would permit this Court to consider the claims.<sup>5</sup>

After receiving an extension of time, Johnson filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation.<sup>6</sup> "If a party objects timely to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court must 'make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations. Upon *de novo* review, the Court finds no error in Chief Magistrate Judge Mehalchick's Report and Recommendation. Consequently, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Chief Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 34) is **ADOPTED**;
- 2. Johnson's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition (Doc. 1) is **DENIED**;
- 3. Johnson's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 25) is **DENIED** as moot;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Doc. 39.

Equal Emp't Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 99 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.

- 4. Johnson's motion for an extension of time to file objections (Doc. 37) is **DENIED** as unnecessary;
- 5. The Court declines to issue certificate of appealability; and
- 6. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

<u>s/Matthew W. Brann</u>Matthew W. BrannChief United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (setting forth legal standard).